

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 16 are pending in this application. Claim 15 is the only independent claim.

By this amendment, claims 1-14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereto, and new claims 15 and 16 are added.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects:

Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,936,744 to Choi (hereafter Choi).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Choi fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in new claims 15 and 16.

For example, in the present invention as set forth in new independent claim 15, a communication apparatus receives an identification signal from an originating communication apparatus and performs an output operation when the received identification signal from the originating communication apparatus coincides with a pre-stored identification signal. The output operation includes an operation of preparing a plurality of copies of recording sheets on which an image data signal received subsequent to the receipt of said identification signal is printed, by repeatedly printing the image data signal.

In contrast with the present invention, Choi merely discloses a facsimile apparatus that merely describes an operation that when the sender's telephone number is registered in the memory 20, image data is received (see Fig. 3 and Column 5, lines 51 to 54, of Choi). Choi fails to teach or suggest an operation of preparing a plurality of copies of recording sheets on which

an image data signal received subsequent to the receipt of the identification signal is printed, by repeatedly printing the image data signal.

An advantage of the present invention is that by preparing a plurality of copies of recording sheets on which an image data signal is printed by repeatedly printing the image data signal, it is not necessary to carry out the subsequent copying operation.

Applicant respectfully points out that in conventional facsimile machines, generally, even if facsimile signals are archived as printed paper documents or in digital form, the copying operation cannot be omitted.

In conventional facsimile machines, generally after the facsimile system prints a document representative of a received facsimile signal, the system compares the ID such as telephone number that corresponds to the received facsimile signal, with a telephone number list stored.

In conventional systems, even if the ID (telephone number) is found in the telephone number list, the system transmits the received facsimile signal to a remote archive station. In the archive station, the facsimile signal is typically archived as printed paper documents, or archived in digital data form .

However, the above noted features are totally different from the present invention, not only in constitution, but also in operational advantage. A key aspect of the present invention is that by preparing a plurality of copies of recording sheets on which an image data signal is printed by repeatedly printing the image data signal, it is not necessary to carry out the subsequent copying operation. However, in conventional systems even if facsimile signals are archived as printed paper documents or digital form, the copying operation cannot be omitted.

Accordingly, the present invention is distinguishable from Choi and the above noted conventional features.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d

1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited reference, Choi, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over Choi for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and allowance of claims 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 to schedule a Personal Interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: January 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant